UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/533,672	07/17/2006	Richard W. McCoy	18801-540	9573	
McDonald Hop	7590 05/05/201 kins Co	EXAMINER			
600 Superior A		VANTERPOOL, LESTER L			
Suite 2100 Cleveland, OH	44114		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3782		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/05/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/533,672	MCCOY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LESTER L. VANTERPOOL	3782	

	LESTER L. VANTERPOOL	3782					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 April 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperture for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Called				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or	,,						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 2, 4-6,8,9,12-14,16,19,21,22,24,26-2</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>8,31 and 32</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Justin M Larson/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U 5/4/11	nit 3782					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 4/18/11 have been fully considered and are not found persuasive.

Applicant argues, Hayama does not disclose, teach or suggest the element "platform comprising a floor, a platform side wall extending vertically from the periphery of the floor".

Examiner disagrees, claim 1 does not set forth any orientation of the cargo container and or how the cargo container is attached to the vehicle. If a plane extends perpendicular from a plane (16B), then the perpendicular plane extends (upward or vertical) or downward from the horiztional plane. Hayama teaches the platform (See Figure 1) comprising the floor (16A), the interior platform side walls of (16C) extending vertically (See Figure 1) from the periphery of the floor (16C) (See Figures 1 & 3). Therefore, Hayama satisfies the limitation set forth in claim 1 of a cargo container connectable to a vehicle.

Applicant argues, the platform sidewall (16c) of Hayama does not extend vertically from the floor (16B) {emphasis added}. Instead, the sidewall (16C) extends horizontally from (16B) {emphasis added}; and t the platform (16) in Hayama would not be capable of supporting the cargo carrier (12) thus rendering the apparatus in Hayama inoperable.

Examiner disagrees, claim 1 does not recite or set forth the orientation or how the cargo carrier is connectable to a vehicle. Therefore, Hayama teaches a cargo container connectable to a vehicle and Hayama clearly discloses the interior and exterior side wall (16C) extending vertically from the platform floor (16B). Figure 3 teaches the interior and exterior side walls (16C) of Hayama extending perpendicular from the floor (16B). If a plane extends perpendicular from a plane (16B), then the perpendicular plane extends (upward or vertical) or downward from the horiztional plane. Therefore, the interior and exterior side walls (16C) extends upward or vertical from the floor (16B) (See Figures 1 & 3).

In addition, Figures 1 & 3 teaches the cargo carrier (12) supported and locked into place by the periphery vertical side walls (16C) via (21A, 22A 24A and 21B).